



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to the welfare of the pupils, and defendant was merely the instrument of its enforcement and not liable. The principal case is one of the most extreme to which this doctrine has been applied, but it seems to fall squarely within the rule of the cases and the injury to the plaintiff was *damnum absque injuria*.

COMMERCE,—INSURANCE,—STATE TAXATION.. Under a Montana statute every insurance company transacting business in the state was taxed upon the excess of premiums received over losses and ordinary expenses within the state. The tax under this statute was contested by a foreign life insurance company. *Held*, insurance is not commerce, interstate or intrastate, and may be taxed by the states although all the contracts are made at the home office, and great and frequent use is made of the mails in the transaction of the business. *New York Life Insurance Company v. Deer Lodge County*, 34 Sup. Ct. 167.

The decision in the principal case states no new doctrine, but confirms in the most positive way a line of decisions which has been the object of constant attack. The original case, *Paul v. Virginia*, 8 Wall. 168, 19 L. Ed. 357, involved the business of fire insurance. It was held that a policy of insurance was not an article of commerce but a mere personal contract incidental to business between the states and that a tax on an agent representing an insurance company domiciled in another state was not a burden on interstate commerce. The same is true of bills of exchange, *Nathan v. Louisiana*, 8 How. 73, 12 L. Ed. 992. See also *Fire Insurance Association of Phila. v. New York*, 119 U. S. 110, 30 L. Ed. 342. The rule was applied to marine insurance in *Hooper v. California*, 155 U. S. 648, 39 L. Ed. 297, 15 Sup. Ct. 207. In this case the court refused to make any distinction between the various kinds of insurance. Nevertheless the application of the doctrine to mutual life insurance was resisted, and in *New York Life Insurance Co. v. Cravens*, 178 U. S. 389, 44 L. Ed. 1116, 20 Sup. Ct. 962, it was definitely applied to that branch of the business. The principal case reviews all of the previous decisions of the court and puts its decision squarely on the rule of "state decisis". The question must be considered as settled for the present at least.

COMMERCE UPON THE HIGH SEAS—IS IT FOREIGN COMMERCE PER SE?—The plaintiff, a steamship company, questioned the right of the state to regulate its rates, because of the fact that a part of its route was upon the high seas. The termini were in the state, and there were no stops made except those within the state. *Held*, that such commerce was not embraced by the commerce clause of the federal constitution, and was subject to direct regulation of the state. *Wilmington Trans. Co. v. Rd. Comm.*, (Cal. 1913), 137 Pac. 1153.

The decision is in direct conflict with *Lord v. S. S. Co.*, 102 U. S. 541 and *Pac. Coast S. S. Co. v. Rd. Comm.*, 18 Fed. 10. In departing from the rule of these cases, the court in the instant case relies on dictum in *Lehigh Valley Rd. v. Pa.*, 145 U. S. 192, 12 Sup. Ct. 806, 36 L. Ed. 672. But, as is pointed out in *Hanley v. Kas. Cy. Ry. Co.*, 187 U. S. 617, 23 Sup. Ct. 214,